

**Highways Maintenance Efficiency Programme – 21st Board Meeting
Friday 31st May 2013, Great Minster House**

Attendees

Stephen Fidler	<i>Chair, DfT</i>	Matthew Lugg OBE	<i>Leicestershire CC</i>
Jason Russell	<i>Surrey CC</i>	Steve Kent	<i>Cheshire West & Chester</i>
David Grunwell	<i>Highways Agency</i>	Tony Gates	<i>HTMA</i>
Haydn Davies	<i>DfT</i>	Lloyd Miles	<i>Secretariat, DfT</i>
Sukhy Duggal	<i>Atkins</i>		

Apologies

Geoff Allister	<i>HTMA</i>	Dana Skelley	<i>Transport for London</i>
Eamon Lally	<i>LGA</i>	Paul Bird	<i>Essex CC</i>
Philip Dyer	<i>Atkins</i>		

Distribution: All present and apologies, plus Gary Thompson (Leicestershire), Tim Pemberton & Jane Coslett (Cheshire West and Chester), Sam Cunningham & Vicki Trust (Surrey), Steve Berry (DfT) and Design Assurance Group (DAG) members.

Agenda

1. Introductions

1.1 Introductions were made. The Board thanked Lloyd Miles for his contribution to HMEP since its start and wished him well for his future role in DfT.

2. Note from 20th Board meeting on 21st March 2013

2.1 These were agreed and had been published.

2.2 The action to identify nominees for the Design Assurance Group (DAG) needed to be completed. To assist, the terms of reference for DAG would be circulated to the Board, and a wider request for members would also be issued (**Action B21-1:** HD/Paul Bird).

2.3 Any other actions still to be completed would be raised within the meeting's agenda.

3. Programme Dashboard

3.1 The Board discussed the latest version of the Programme Dashboard, and key points are noted below.

3.2 Knowledge Hub: The LGA has raised the option of closing their Knowledge Hub facility. This, and the possible need for a successor host, would be an issue for the E&E group.

3.3 Finances: A summary had been circulated in advance on a number of projects that required additional funds due to increases in scope. These were discussed and agreed as proposed.

- 3.4 The Board requested a more consistent approach on how changes to project budgets were presented, and confirmation of the delegated authority threshold for the HMEP Programme Manager to approve funding changes without referring them to the Board (**Action B21-2: HD**).
- 3.5 The re-imburement arrangements for Board Advocates and their associated project management costs for their portfolios had originally been agreed up to March 2013. The Board agreed that these should be reviewed and where necessary extended to the end of March 2014, but stressed that the arrangements must only be used when essential.

4. Benefits

- 4.1 SD gave an update on the process to complete and maintain the benefits dashboard, and how programme wide benefits realisation process would be managed.
- 4.2 An increasing focus was being placed on benefits realisation across HMEP, and it was important that the various groups coordinated their work. The capability of product users to complete any returns must be a key factor in any benefits management system, but this would need to be balanced against the programme's need to clearly demonstrate efficiencies realised.
- 4.3 A suggestion was made that as a requirement of Government's highways maintenance funding local highway authorities be required to state what efficiency measures from the programme they are adopting, possibly on their website for transparency purposes. This matched the requirement on additional funding provided for potholes in 2010/11.
- 4.4 The deep dive review of the Supply Chain Review project had now been completed. JR would circulate to the Board the outcome of the review and the request for funding to meet the additional scope now envisaged (**Action B21-3: JR**).

5. Business Plan 2013/14 incl. gap analysis and road map

- 5.1 HD gave a presentation on the outline proposals and it was noted that capturing sector input would be a key element of this process. The Board agreed that this work would continue, and that the next meeting include a workshop to ensure all the relevant ideas and suggestions for taking the programme forward are discussed and captured.
- 5.2 It was agreed that no more projects would be approved until the business plan and gap analysis were completed. But the asset management training could still proceed through the normal gateways because it was a long standing commitment.

6. Programme Support

- 6.1 JR described the mechanism and progress on entering a new contract for programme support once the current contract with Atkins ends, and

the proposal for bridging the gap between the contracts. This was agreed by the Board as it was essential to retain the programme's momentum, and DfT would issue appropriate approval letters to Surrey regarding the funding of these contracts (**Action B21-4: HD**).

7. Post 2014 progress

7.1 An agreement in principle had been reached with the preferred host organisation for a number of support activities and further meetings were being arranged to agree the details.

7.2 There were potentially a wide range of activities to transfer, and it is anticipated that these would proceed at different speeds. The Board agreed that there was a need to reach agreement on key activities promptly so that the host organisation could take an active role from October 2013 onwards.

7.3 The Board noted that there would still be scope for HMEP to call on other specialist services outside of this hosting arrangement.

8. AIA/RACF/ADEPT, road maintenance and HMEP strategy

8.1 HD presented a paper on HMEP's engagement with other organisations and their respective media strategies. The Board agreed that there was potential for greater coordination between the various media campaigns, and also other government initiatives. An action plan for taking this forward, and an appropriate handling strategy, would be prepared via the Engage and Enable Group. It was noted that this plan should not be a wider consultation with the entire sector (**Action B21-5: HD**).

9. Projects requiring decision

7.1 The following projects, and respective DAG recommendations, were discussed.

7.2 Client Capability (Gateway 0 to define stage)

7.2.1 ML and Denise Bower (University of Leeds) gave a presentation following the concerns raised by the Board when the proposal had previously been circulated for approval. Points raised by the Board included;

- i) Greater clarity was needed on whether the proposal was aimed at individuals or an organisation as a whole. It was felt that the latter was where HMEP could deliver most benefits;
- ii) Was the process a one-off event, or part of an organisation's on-going assessment and development?
- iii) How was the product linked to other HMEP projects and the programme's overall engagement strategy?
- iv) The need to avoid the project creating systems that duplicate or conflict with those already developed by HMEP and others. It should complement and clarify, and not confuse or compromise;

v) Tony Gates agreed to act as a 'critical friend' to assist the project team in addressing these concerns.

7.2.2 The Board gave approval for the project to proceed to define stage, subject to the project team incorporating and addressing these issues as appropriate.

7.3 Strategic Review

7.3.1 JR updated the Board regarding the progress of the current strategic reviews. The Board were now broadly content with LGA model, and that the remaining 4 'pilots' should become 'mainstream' reviews to take place in 2013/14.

7.3.2 For 2013/14 the existing approved funding arrangements would remain (i.e. HMEP pick up 100% as reward for early take up), while for 2014/15 onwards HMEP would share costs with any organisations (probably on a 50/50 basis), subject to funding being available.

7.4 Potholes Review: progress report

7.4.1 ML described the draft report that had been circulated to the Board. Road condition currently had a high media profile, and this report was likely to receive further attention.

7.4.2 The Board felt that while the content was good, especially the case studies, it still needed further work on presenting its messages, i.e. deadlines, timelines and benefits available. The following actions were agreed (**Action B21-6: All**).

- i) Board members to review the current draft and provide comments to Matthew Lugg (cc Gary Thompson) by close Friday 14th June.
- ii) SF would separately provide some comments on higher level messages.
- iii) Once these comments had been included a further draft would be reviewed by the Atkins Communications team.
- iv) DfT would in parallel review the recommendations it was tasked with and update on progress.
- vi) The progress report would be published by HMEP, but with DfT/Ministerial input as appropriate.
- v) A final version, including any response on the outcome of the spending review, would be circulated to the Board in late June for final approval before publication in early July after the spending review.

10. **Date of next meetings**

- Thursday 1st August, 10:00, GMH
- Friday 18th October, 10:00, GMH
- Thursday 21st November, 10:00, GMH